



David B. Cohen
Mayor

CITY OF NEWTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Department of Planning and Development
Michael J. Kruse, Director

Telephone

(617)-796-1120

Telefax

(617) 796-1142

E-mail

mkruse@ci.newton.ma.us

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Public Hearing Date: | May 11, 2004 |
| Land Use Action Date: | June 8, 2004 |
| Board of Aldermen Action Date: | June 21, 2004 |
| 90-Day Expiration Date: | August 9, 2004 |

TO: Board of Aldermen

FROM: Michael Kruse, Director of Planning and Development
Nancy Radzevich, Development Review Coordinator
Alexandra Ananth, Planner

SUBJECT: Petition #211-04 of EMERALD DEVELOPMENT GROUP, INC./LORNA & ROGER KELLY for a SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN APPROVAL to construct two new single-family attached dwellings connected to an existing single-family dwelling to create a new three-unit attached dwelling at 91 CENTRAL STREET, Ward 4, AUBURNDALE, on land known as Sec 43, Blk 14, Lot 6, containing approx. 18,750 sf of land in a district zoned MULTI RESIDENCE 1.

CC: Mayor David B. Cohen

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Board of Aldermen and the public with technical information and planning analysis which may be useful in the special permit decision making process of the Board of Aldermen. The Planning Department's intention is to provide a balanced view of the issues with the information it has at the time of the public hearing. There may be other information presented at or after the public hearing that the Land Use Committee of the Board of Aldermen will consider in its discussion at a subsequent Working Session.

I. ELEMENTS OF THE PETITION

The subject property is located at 91 Central Street, and consists of an 18,750 sq. ft. lot improved with a 3-story, Italianate-style residence circa 1865. Though the petitioners have stated that this is a single-family dwelling, the lot is located in a district zoned Multi-Residence 1, and is listed as a two-family dwelling in the City Assessor's Database. Regardless of whether this structure is being used as a single- or two-family residence, the petitioners are proposing to add 2 single-family attached dwelling units on to the rear of the existing structure, for a total of 3 single-family attached dwelling units on site.

The City's Chief Zoning Code Official has completed his review of this application for special permit. A copy of his memorandum, dated May 3, 2004, is attached to this document (SEE ATTACHMENT "A").

II. ZONING RELIEF BEING SOUGHT

The petitioners are seeking approval through or relief from the following sections of the City's Zoning Ordinance:

- 1. Section 30-9(b)(5) allows the Board of Aldermen to grant a special permit in a Multi-Residence District for single family attached dwellings.*
- 2. Section 30-9(b)(5)(b) allows the Board of Aldermen to grant exceptions to Section 30-9(b)(5)(a) (no parking space shall be located within 20 ft. of a boundary line and no driveway shall be located within 10 ft. of a side or rear lot line) and to the dimensional controls in Section 30-15, if it is determined that literal compliance is impractical due to the nature of the use, or the location, size, frontage, depth, shape, or grade of the lot, or that such exceptions would be in the public interest, or in the interest of safety or protection of environmental features.*
- 3. Section 30-19(m) allows the Board of Aldermen to grant a special permit to allow for exceptions to the parking requirements. The petitioners are requesting approval of one tandem parking space per unit.*

III. SIGNIFICANT ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

In reviewing this petition, the Board should consider the following:

- Whether the specific site is an appropriate location for a 3-family attached dwelling;*
- Whether the two additional units and associated changes to the parking area will result in vehicular or pedestrian safety concerns; and*
- Whether the design and scale of the addition and associated changes to the parking area are appropriate to the existing structure, site, and neighborhood.*

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITE AND NEIGHBORHOOD

A. Site

The subject property is located at 91 Central Street, in Auburndale. The site consists of an 18,750 sq. ft. lot, which is currently improved with a 3-story, Italianate-style residence. According to the City Assessor's Database, the existing structure is approximately 2,900 sq.ft. and includes a 3-story square tower addition located at the southeast corner of the building, which contains a two-story bay window. The residence has had several alterations over the years including the application of aluminum siding and the original windows have been replaced.

The site is also improved with a detached garage in the northwest corner of the property and a large shed/playhouse on the eastern side of the property. Both of

these accessory structures were built in the 1940s and are proposed for demolition.



91 Central Street

B. Neighborhood and Zoning

The subject property is located on the north side of Central Street in Auburndale, between Grove and Maple Streets. The parcel is part of a block that is zoned Multi-Residence 1, but is surrounded by areas zoned Single Residence 2 and 3. The parcel is located 1 block south of the MassTurnpike.

The majority of the block is comprised of two-family structures including the lots bordering the subject property to the north and west. The subject property is bordered on the east by a small single family structure built in 1986. The subject property is one of the largest lots on the block. Two other properties on the block contain three-family structures. Overall, the existing structure is in scale with other residences in the immediate neighborhood.

V. ANALYSIS

A. Technical Considerations

The following table compares the proposed addition to the technical requirements as follows:

| Attached Dwellings in Multi-Residence 1 (by special permit) | Required (for attached dwellings) | Existing | Proposed |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| Minimum lot size | 15,000 sq. ft | 18,750 sq. ft. | 18,750 sq. ft. |
| Minimum lot area per unit | 4,000 sq. ft. | 9,375 sq. ft. | 6,250sq.ft. |
| Frontage | 80 ft. | 105 ft. | 105 ft. |
| Setbacks | | | |
| Front | 25 ft. | 35.2 ft. | 35.2 ft. |
| Side (west) | 25 ft. | 50 ft. | 33 ft. |
| Side (east) | 25 ft. | 10.6 ft. | 10.1 ft. |
| Rear | 25 ft. | 47.8 ft. | 16.1 ft. |
| Building height | 30 ft. | 36.7 ft. | 29.4 ft. (proposed addition) |
| Max. # of stories | 2½-stories | 2½-stories | 2½-stories |
| Floor area ratio | Max. set on a case by case basis | .16 | .42 |
| Lot coverage | 25% | 14.6% | 23.6% |
| Open space | 50% | 74.0% | 60.0% |

As illustrated above, the existing building is 10.6 ft. from the east side lot line and the petitioners are proposing to locate a new staircase to a proposed patio along this side. Although the existing house meets the 7.5 ft. side setback requirements for single- and two-family dwellings, it does not meet the 25 ft. side and rear setback requirements for attached dwellings. The petitioners are seeking relief through Section 30-9(5)(b), which allows for exceptions to the dimensional controls in Section 30-15.

For reference purposes the maximum permitted FAR for a two-family structure in this district is .4. The existing structure has an approximate FAR of .16. The petitioners are proposing an FAR of .42.

B. Land Use

The petitioners are proposing to construct two new single-family attached dwellings connected to the existing residence for a total of 3 units on-site. Though the site is zoned for multi-family use, the Planning Department has concerns regarding the proposed density, site design, massing of the structure, requested relief from dimensional controls, and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Department also notes that there are no other attached dwelling units in the immediate neighborhood.

The Planning Department believes a 2-family dwelling that preserves the existing structure would be better suited for the site and more in character with the surrounding neighborhood. A three-family residence of a scale that is more in keeping with the surrounding residences (i.e. 1,400-1,800 sq. ft. per unit) may also fit in, if the massing and site design could be improved to better preserve the context of the existing historic structure.

The Planning Department had prepared the attached (*SEE “ATTACHMENT B”*) analysis of the block, which contains information on lot size, number of units on site, lot area per unit, dwelling size, approximate floor area per unit, and approximate FAR. It appears that the subject property is one of the largest lots on the block. Though the proposed additional unit would not cause significant deviation from the average lot area per unit, *the proposed structure would be significantly larger than any other structure on the immediate block. In addition, the individual units would be almost double the average housing unit size for the neighborhood.*

C. Building Design and Site Improvements

The subject property consists of an 18,750 sq. ft. lot improved with a 3-story, Italianate style residence circa 1865. Though the structure has been altered over the years it has retained much of its original detail and is included on the historic resource inventory. Many of the surrounding residences also date from the late 19th Century. The petitioners applied for a demolition permit in July 2003 and a 1-year demolition delay was placed on the structure that expires in July 2004.

The petitioners are proposing to demolish a portion of the rear of the existing structure and to add 2 single-family attached dwelling units, for a total of 3 single-family attached dwelling units on site. Though the proposed addition appears to echo the existing structure in some ways (roof pitch, heavy bracketed cornices, front porches), the addition is poorly integrated into the existing dwelling and is attached to the existing structure via a new 1-story flat roofed garage. Furthermore, the length, mass, and location of the attached dwellings over-power the existing structure and may take away from the historic context of the original house. The proposed additional units are significantly larger in scale than surrounding dwelling units and their attached dwelling unit style does not appear to be in keeping with the two-family character of other houses in the neighborhood. Multiple structural encroachments occur in required setback areas including the rear unit and stairs leading to proposed patios.

It should be noted that none of the building materials of the proposed addition or existing structure are specified on the plans. ***The petitioners should submit revised plans showing proposed building materials prior to being scheduled for a Working Session.***

D. Parking

The petitioners are proposing to remove the existing driveway and paved circular walkway element in front of the existing house, and to relocate the driveway further west. According to the April 2004 Site Plan and requested zoning relief, there appears to be a total of 9 parking stalls on this property. Three stalls are located in single car garages (one pre unit), 3 exterior tandem stalls are located in front of the garages, and 3 other exterior stalls are located on the west side of the driveway near the western property line. *Though the site plan does not show the dimensions or setbacks of the proposed exterior parking stalls it appears that 3 exterior stalls are located within the required 20-ft. side setback, for which the*

petitioners are seeking relief.

The Chief Zoning Code Official notes that the petitioners are proposing more than 5 parking stalls and, therefore, their parking plan may need to meet the requirements of Section 30-19 (h)-(j) (*applicable to parking facilities with more than 5 stalls*). *The site plan submitted does not meet all applicable requirements and is considered incomplete.* Unfortunately, the petitioners did not review these plans with the Planning Department until after they were filed. The Planning Department suggested a number of changes, and specifically cited the need for dimensioned plans as soon as possible. ***Revised dimensioned site plans have not yet been submitted, but should be expected prior to the close of the public hearing so as to provide the Land Use Committee and public with complete and accurate information.***

E. Landscaping

The petitioners appear to be removing 2 existing trees from the site but are proposing additional landscaping improvements throughout the site, including replacement trees. The petitioners will be required to meet the City's Tree Preservation Ordinance.

Though the petitioners are proposing some new trees along the west side lot line the Planning Department is not sure this will adequately screen the abutting residence at 99-101 Central Street from the proposed parking along this lot line. The petitioners should consult with all immediate abutters and consider revising the landscape plan with more dense mature evergreen screening along all property lines.

F. Department Reviews

The Engineering Division of the Public Works Department is expected to complete their site engineering review under separate cover prior to the public hearing.

G. Relevant Site Plan Approval Criteria

1. Convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and in relation to adjacent streets, properties or improvements.

The proposed circulation pattern indicates that a new 12 ft. wide curb-cut will extend from Central Street along the western side of the site approximately 145 ft. back, with 3 exterior parking stalls that appear to be located within the 20 ft. side yard setback (and as close as 5 ft in some cases). The petitioners are also requesting 3 tandem parking stalls in front of the garages, though these stalls are not clearly shown on the site plan. *None of the parking stalls and maneuvering aisle are dimensioned on the site plan on file with the Planning Department and the Planning Department questions if there is adequate room for circulation in the proposed driveway if cars are parked in the exterior parking stalls. The City Traffic Engineer should be expected to provide further comments*

on this subject. Revised dimensioned site plans should be submitted prior to the close of the public hearing.

2. Screening of parking areas and structures.

Based on the submitted landscape plan, dated 4/12/04 by Architectural Partners, Inc, it is not clear if landscape screening of the exterior parking areas and new construction are adequate, specifically along the western property line. Though the petitioners are proposing to maintain the existing stockade fence, it appears the petitioners are relying on the existing fence and trees to screen the proposed additional attached dwelling units from abutting residences. *The Planning Department recommends that additional dense mature evergreen screening be installed in the southwest area of the lot and along the property lines in order to screen the proposed attached dwelling units.*

3. Avoidance of major topographical changes.

The project is designed to work with the existing topography and the plans do not indicate any changes of grade in excess of 3 ft.

4. Consideration of site design.

As stated earlier, though the subject property is one of the largest lots in the immediate area, the proposed attached dwellings will be significantly larger than the existing structure and surrounding residences. There are multiple structural encroachments into required setback areas and the *Planning Department recommends that the petitioners reduce the scale of the proposed addition, or consider reducing the number of units from three to two.*

5. Adequacy of disposal of wastes.

The petitioners have not indicated where trash will be stored for collection. The petitioners should provide further information on this subject prior to the Working Session.

6. Avoidance of the removal or disruption of historic resources.

The subject structure was built circa 1865. Though the structure has been altered over the years it has retained much of its original detail and is included on the historic resource inventory. The petitioners applied for a demolition permit and a 1-year demolition delay was placed on the structure but expires in July 2004. The petitioners are proposing to maintain the existing structure and are proposing to replicate some of its architectural elements in the proposed attached dwelling units. However, the massing of the structure and siting of the additional units appear to overpower the existing historic structure and disrupt the historical context of the existing residence. ***Additionally, revised plans have been requested***

that indicate the proposed building materials. These plans should be submitted prior to this petition being scheduled for a Working Session

H. Relevant Special Permit Criteria

1. The specific site is an appropriate location for such use/structure.

The site is located in a Multi-Residence 1 District, mostly comprised of two-family structures. Though there are two other three-family structures on the block, the proposed attached dwelling units are significantly larger than the existing structure and all of the surrounding residences, and appear to be out of context with the surrounding two-family neighborhood. The Planning Department believes that a two-family dwelling or a much reduced three-family residence that preserves the existing structure and meets the dimensional controls and parking setback requirements would be more appropriate for this location and would provide a more suitable extension of the existing historic structure.

2. The use as developed and operated will not adversely affect the neighborhood.

The Planning Department believes that the proposed use as developed will adversely affect the neighborhood, as the attached units appear to be out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Department also believes that the dimensional controls and parking setback requirements should be met in order to minimize impacts on the neighborhood.

3. There will be no nuisance or serious hazard to vehicles or pedestrians.

See Sections V.-D., and G.-1. & 2.

4. Access to the site over streets is appropriate for the types and numbers of vehicles involved.

See Sections V.-D., and G.-1. & 2.

VI. SUMMARY

The subject property is located at 91 Central Street, and consists of an 18,750 sq. ft. lot improved with a 3-story, Italianate-style residence circa 1865. Though the petitioners have stated that this is an existing single-family dwelling, the lot is located in a district zoned Multi-Residence 1, and is listed as a two-family dwelling in the City's Assessor's Database. Regardless of whether this structure is being used as a single or two-family structure, the petitioners are seeking relief to attach 2 single-family attached dwelling units on to the rear of the existing structure, for a total of 3 single-family attached dwelling units on site. The petitioners are also seeking relief to locate parking stalls within 20 ft. of a boundary line, for waivers from the dimensional controls for the side and rear yard setbacks, and for three tandem parking stalls.

Though the site is zoned for multi-family use, the Planning Department has significant concerns regarding the proposed density, site design, mass of the structure, requested

relief from dimensional controls, and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Department also notes that there are no other attached dwelling units in the immediate neighborhood.

The Planning Department believes a 2-family dwelling that preserves the existing structure would be better suited for the site and more in character with the surrounding neighborhood. A three-family residence of a scale that is more in keeping with the surrounding residences (i.e. 1,400-1,800 sq. ft. per unit) may also fit in, if the massing and site design could be improved to better preserve the context of the existing historic structure.

Prior to the close of the public hearing the petitioners should provide properly dimensioned site plans.

Prior to the Working Session:

- 1. The petitioners should respond to all issues raised by the Chief Zoning Code Official and Engineering Division; and***
- 2. The petitioners should submit revised architectural elevations to the Planning Department.***

ATTACHMENT “B”

Neighborhood Comparison Chart

| <u>Address</u> | <u>Lot Area</u> | <u># of Units</u> | <u>Lot Area Per Unit¹</u> | <u>Total Building Area</u> | <u>Approx. Floor Area Per Unit</u> | <u>Approx. FAR</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 6 Grove St | 10,459 | 3 | 3,486 | 3,937 | 1,312 | 0.38 |
| 12-14 Grove St | 5,618 | 2 | 2,809 | 2,432 | 1,216 | 0.43 |
| 16-18 Grove St | 4,271 | 2 | 2,136 | 2,508 | 1,254 | 0.59 |
| 115 Central St | 5,998 | 2 | 2,999 | 2,412 | 1,206 | 0.40 |
| 107-109 Central St | 12,635 | 2 | 6,318 | 4,178 | 2,089 | 0.33 |
| 99-101 Central St | 12,443 | 2 | 6,222 | 3,381 | 1,691 | 0.27 |
| 91 Central St (existing) | 18,750 | 2 | 9,375 | 2,910 | 1,455 | 0.16 |
| 85 Central St | 11,211 | 1 | 11,211 | 1,726 | 1,726 | 0.15 |
| 81 Central St | 5,182 | 1 | 5,182 | 1,970 | 1,970 | 0.38 |
| 75-77 Central St | 9,283 | 2 | 4,642 | 2,919 | 1,460 | 0.31 |
| 23-25 Maple St | 13,860 | 2 | 6,930 | 3,150 | 1,575 | 0.23 |
| 17-19 Maple St | 7,150 | 2 | 3,575 | 3,062 | 1,531 | 0.43 |
| 9-11 Maple St | 10,630 | 2 | 5,315 | 2,548 | 1,274 | 0.24 |
| 208 Auburn St. | 12,003 | 1 | 12,003 | 1,776 | 1,776 | 0.15 |
| 214 Auburn St | 11,800 | 2 | 5,900 | 2,844 | 1,422 | 0.24 |
| 220 Auburn St | 12,730 | 2 | 6,365 | 2,807 | 1,404 | 0.22 |
| 224-24 Auburn St | 10,412 | 2 | 5,206 | 2,870 | 1,435 | 0.28 |
| 228-30 Auburn St | 13,098 | 2 | 6,549 | 2,896 | 1,448 | 0.22 |
| 236 Auburn St | 18,760 | 3 | 6,253 | 3,426 | 1,142 | 0.18 |
| Average | | | 5,625 | 2,689 | 1,420 | 0.29 |

¹ Based on the Assessing Database.

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|---|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 91 Central St (proposed) | 18,750 | 3 | 6,250 | 7,822 | 2,607 | 0.42 |